

Date: Wed, 7 Apr 93 04:30:25 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #86
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 7 Apr 93 Volume 93 : Issue 86

Today's Topics:

2 meter phone calls?
AM vs CW (2 msgs)
Another 3rd Party Question
CW vs AM (3 msgs)
Just waiting the OFs out
No-code issue (4 msgs)
No Code Issue

The exception proves the rule; was: Re: 2 meter phone calls?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 4 Apr 93 14:08:41 GMT
From: usc!wupost!uwm.edu!msuinfo!netnews.upenn.edu!priyat!bill@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 2 meter phone calls?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

As long as we are going to take such a strict interpretation of the
rules, wouldn't that mean that all HAMFEST talk-ins are
illegal?? The sole purpose of the talk-in is to get you there. The
first thing they do when you get there is take your admission fee.
The main reason for going is to look for something to buy.
The violation here seems rather clear to me.

But then, I don't usually look for the most restrictive interpretation
I can find.

bill KB3YV

--

```
Bill Gunshannon      | "There are no evil thoughts, Mr. Reardon" Francisco  
bill@cs.uofs.edu     | said softly, "except one; the refusal to think."  
                     | #include <std disclaimer.h>
```

Date: 5 Apr 1993 19:36:31 -0500
From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!gerald@cc.utexas.edu!
emx.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: AM vs CW
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dstine@cisco.com (David Stine) replies to my posting:

>>If you think that, given your analysis, SSB is more efficient than CW at
>>transmitting 'real' information, then you have never really operated CW;
>>you've simply played around with using Morse Code.

That's possibly true. All I meant was that if you wanted to convey the text of the most recent editorial in QST, it would be quicker to do it by reading it out loud than by sending it via CW. That's all I meant, and I think that is what is meant by people who claim that CW is an inefficient mode. I wasn't necessarily agreeing with them.

>>Everyone keeps repeating the same lies, over and over, until they become
>>truth. "CW is dead. CW is inefficient at transmitting information..."

That's not what I think, I was just saying what some people would, although you can't use many Q signals in sending the QST editorial. I have listened to enough phone and CW QSOs on the air to know that the information transfer rate is similar - while a CW op sends "op Bob", the phone op says "well, the handle at this end is Bob - that's Bravo Oscar Bravo, Bravo Oscar Bob, Bob is the handle here". When you include all the throat clearings and repetition, the CW op gets more information over faster, in many cases.

I think we basically agree, I was simply saying that even given the way most hams operate day to day, it's not fair or true to say that CW is inefficient. If you talk efficiently, you can transfer text at a faster rate with voice, all other things being equal - it's just that other things usually aren't equal (signal to noise ratio, bandwidth used etc). If you want to send the text of the QST editorial simultaneously in 10 different languages within no more than 2 KHz

bandwidth, you can do it in CW but not using SSB.

Derek "that's Delta Echo Romeo Echo Kilo" Wills (AA5BT, G3NMX)
Department of Astronomy, University of Texas,
Austin TX 78712. (512-471-1392)
oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu

Date: 6 Apr 1993 16:57:01 +0300
From: news.tele.fi!news.funet.fi!butler.cc.tut.fi!lehtori.cc.tut.fi!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: AM vs CW
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

This thread is once again comparing apples and oranges.
We have to define what we mean by efficiency and "real
information".

If we want to transfer a predefined amount of information
(eg. a "standard" QSO), it doesn't matter if we send it in
a short time using a large bandwidth or if we use a small
bandwidth and a longer time if we only look at spectral
efficiency. You could get a single figure of merit for
spectral efficiency by multiplying bandwidth with transmission
time.

A larger bandwidth usually requires more power. By multiplying
the power by the transmission time, you get the total energy
you need to transfer the message.

You could multiply the spectral efficiency with the energy if
you want a single figure of merit for communication efficiency.
You could trade lower power for longer transmission times (poor
S/N --> more repeats or you have to spell out every word) and
still get the same communication efficiency.

What I am trying to say is that one modulation method is not
necessarily better than an other method if *the amount of
information is predefined* (eg. a "standard" QSO that is
required for logging, QSL or award purposes).

That was the communication efficiency and that was the easy
part since it is much harder to define what is meaningful
information.

In a DX-pileup you want to get your call into the log of the

DX-station (the report is 59(9) anyway so no meaningful information is transferred). This means that the DX-station only wants to know which one of a few million (potential) ham-stations is calling him. The meaningful information is thus about 20 bits. To transfer this information using CW is quite effective (but still far from the theoretical limit) but transferring it in phone spelling out the callsign is grossly inefficient in terms of bandwidth and power.

Transferring plain text is not very effective in CW as the alphabet is too restricted (no upper/lower case) and the Q-signs are useful only if the vocabulary is restricted and the language has a lot of prepositions (like English). Packet and Pactor are more suitable for plain text.

Phone is the only mode available if you want to transfer subtle variations (emphasis etc.) in a spoken signal. Such variations can be classified as meaningful information eg. in a heated discussion.

There is not a single mode for all all kinds of communication. The most effective mode should be used for each kind of communication. Rather than requiring proficiency in one or more modes, it is much more important to know the benefits and drawbacks for each mode.

Paul OH3LWR

Date: 4 Apr 93 17:30:43 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Another 3rd Party Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hi Charlie,

The reason we don't have third party agreements with European countries is because their telecommunications organizations have monopolies on their telephone systems and such. The policy of the State Department is that the US will be glad to enter into a third party agreement with any country, but that particular country must first approach the US with its intentions. Typically, the US benefits more from the presence of such an agreement due to the large numbers of amateurs in this country. 73.

John

John Hennessee KJ4KB
ARRL Regulatory Information Specialist
225 Main St
Newington CT 06111
203 666-1541
jhenness@arrl.org

Date: Tue, 6 Apr 1993 13:33:28 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!
news.iastate.edu!IASTATE.EDU!wjturner@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: CW vs AM
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> There is much more to being a _good_ CW op than just Morse; there are also
> many, many more "Q" signals than most people commonly know and there is the
> Phillips code. When you combine these, a good CW op who is running about 35
> WPM (of clear text) actually has a throughput of well over 100 WPM of
> information.

OK, I'll bite! What is the "Phillips code"? I don't recall ever hearing of it
before.

--
Will Turner, N0RDV
wjturner@iastate.edu | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov -----

I may not be for code requirements, but I still love CW.
LONG LIVE CW!!

Date: 4 Apr 1993 20:54:08 -0500
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!emx.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-
mail@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: CW vs AM
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

mellob@cary108.its.rpi.edu (Brett A. Mellor) suggests:

>>I think the number of code users will become so small that
>>more and more other hams will fight to get the "inefficient"

>>code off the air entirely. If I'm not stating this clearly,
>>which I'm probably not because I'm an engineer), just look at
>>the controversy surrounding AM. CW will suffer the same way.

But AM is "inefficient" in the sense of how much bandwidth it takes up, and by this definition CW is even more efficient than SSB, so it's SSB that should be banished from the bands (I could stand it!). CW is admittedly inefficient in that few people can send or receive it manually at the 100+ wpm rate of the human voice. So to the extent that one is actually relaying meaningful information, SSB is more efficient than CW if the signals are strong and you are the only person on the band. However, I rarely find myself on an uncrowded band working strong signals, and I rarely hear any meaningful information being exchanged anyway....

The only real reason I hear for AM being retained is nostalgia, and that is often stated as the main reason for retaining CW, but I don't think that holds water. CW has always been more "efficient" than phone in most senses on the ham bands, and there is no rational justification for AM being retained, whereas there is for CW (I think).

I agree with pretty much everything Brett said in his posting. CW is going to disappear from the licensing requirements over the next few years, I'm pretty sure, and with more people using SSB, there will be a push to take away much of the CW bands just because SSB *is* so inefficient in bandwidth. The only recourse you have on phone to get the signal through against the competition is to go to 1500 watts, and when everyone has done that, there will be a push for higher power levels because 1500 watts is just too "inefficient".

This is all rather depressing. Perhaps we can fight to reduce the maximum power level to 5 watts (avoiding cancer risks and that, right?) - and *then* we'll see who has more fun on the bands, the SSBers or the CWers.

I think I'll go and doing something less depressing now, like the income tax...

Derek Wills (AA5BT, G3NMX)
Department of Astronomy, University of Texas,
Austin TX 78712. (512-471-1392)
oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu

Date: 5 Apr 1993 22:06:25 GMT
From: cronkite.cisco.com!dstine@ames.arpa
Subject: CW vs AM
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1po3g0INNg0d@emx.cc.utexas.edu> oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Wills) writes:

>CW is
>admittedly inefficient in that few people can send or receive it manually
>at the 100+ wpm rate of the human voice. So to the extent that one is
>actually relaying meaningful information, SSB is more efficient than CW
>if the signals are strong and you are the only person on the band. However,
>I rarely find myself on an uncrowded band working strong signals, and I
>rarely hear any meaningful information being exchanged anyway....

If you think that, given your analysis, SSB is more efficient than CW at transmitting 'real' information, then you have never really operated CW; you've simply played around with using Morse Code.

There is much more to being a _good_ CW op than just Morse; there are also many, many more "Q" signals than most people commonly know and there is the Phillips code. When you combine these, a good CW op who is running about 35 WPM (of clear text) actually has a throughput of well over 100 WPM of information.

It is this lack of knowledge of CW operating which I find most depressing. Everyone keeps repeating the same lies, over and over, until they become truth. "CW is dead. CW is inefficient at transmitting information..."

Listen to some _good_ CW traffic ops sometime. Unless you've done your homework, you most likely will be left wondering what they are talking about. Good Q-signal usage, Phillips, full QSK and a tight filter and you're going to get some real work done.

>I agree with pretty much everything Brett said in his posting. CW is going
>to disappear from the licensing requirements over the next few years, I'm
>pretty sure, and with more people using SSB, there will be a push to take
>away much of the CW bands just because SSB *is* so inefficient in bandwidth.

And because unlike the efforts of things like coherent CW, the average SSB op isn't really interested in new technologies which would take up less bandwidth while requiring some greater level of technical skill.

>The only recourse you have on phone to get the signal through against the
>competition is to go to 1500 watts, and when everyone has done that, there
>will be a push for higher power levels because 1500 watts is just too
>"inefficient".

Let's not forget all the speech processors, clippers and echo boxes employed by these new, oh-so-much welcomed hams who did a stint on 27MHz. They can take a signal which would otherwise fit nicely into a 3kHz

bandwidth and make it take up 100kHz, noooooo problem.

On a modern rig, I defy anyone here to make a case as to how someone who isn't changing the fundamental switching characteristics of the keying circuit in a rig can accomplish the same level of waste with a CW signal.

>This is all rather depressing. Perhaps we can fight to reduce the maximum
>power level to 5 watts (avoiding cancer risks and that, right?) - and *then*
>we'll see who has more fun on the bands, the SSBers or the CWers.

No contest. And I doubt it would really happen. (sooner or later, the truth about this "RF causes cancer bullshit will get out) But it would be fun to watch a the clueless among the SSB ops (and I'm not saying that anywhere close to the majority of SSB ops are clueless) shout themselves red in the face "trying to be heard."

dsa

Date: 4 Apr 93 14:04:19 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!ncr-sd!ncrcae!toontown!craig@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Just waiting the OFs out
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr4.054915.6242@nnnnpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

|
| Fortunately for those of us that believe the code requirements are
| little more than antiquated hazing practices, time and soon numbers are
| on our side. The no-code license is currently the entry license of
| choice. I seriously doubt that all these new amateurs will turn around
| and suggest that the no-code license be eliminated. In fact, I predict
| they will advocate further reduction in code requirements and greater
| licensing requirements in technical and operating areas. As the new
| blood replaces the old, the numbers will eventually be there to make
| further licensing changes.

|
| It's all a matter of time.

I hope you're right. I haven't even thought of getting a license until the no-code license. If I get one I probably wouldn't get a code license because I wouldn't use code anyway so wouldn't get proficient in code to progress any further. Is there a need for code anymore?

Craig

--

-Craig Williamson
Craig.Williamson@ColumbiaSC.NCR.COM
craig@toontown.ColumbiaSC.NCR.COM (home)

"Dinna ya know a jailbreak
when ya see it?"
-Scotty STV

Date: 5 Apr 93 14:46:17
From: sun-barr!male.EBay.Sun.COM!jethro.Corp.Sun.COM!exodus.Eng.Sun.COM!
appserv.Eng.Sun.COM!appserv!rfm@ames.arpa
Subject: No-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <61b5_6=@rpi.edu> mellob@cary104.its.rpi.edu (Brett A. Mellor) writes:

So I feel fine about the code requirement. I would prefer that
the entry-level technician license be non-renewable. Leading
to the idea that you would have to upgrade eventually.

So in someone else's words, quit wining and do it.

Besides learning Dark Ages communication modes, now you want me to
give up wine? What next, a vow of chastity?

Rich

--
Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Date: 6 Apr 1993 16:29:36 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!eff!ssd.intel.com!
chnews!joshua!jbromley@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No-code Issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jbromley@joshua.intel.com (James Bromley~) quotes himself:

>>Well, smiley or no, they are gross generalizations. And they are
>>generalizations that the U.S. government has written into the rules
>>and regulations of a quasi-judicial agency.

In article <0!d51vn@rpi.edu> mellob@rpi.edu (Brett Mellor) writes:

>Why do you feel that my stating that the harder you work for something,

>the more you respect it, is a "gross generalization?"

In my view, this is the Protestant work ethic warmed over twice. It is a statement of personal values that you assume everyone else shares. I don't share it. And the thing that makes it gross is that it is written into law. As a citizen, I feel the premises behind lawmaking should be under constant re-examination, particularly when they impinge on my freedom as this one (FCC regs.) does.

- Jim Bromley, W5GYJ

Date: 5 Apr 1993 05:55:24 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!bobw@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

[stuff deleted]

>

> The reason the HF morse requirement should be kept as-is is that it encourages
> the casual, day to day use of CW, instead of or in addition to sideband.
> Unlike the VHF/UHF/SHF spectrum, where we possess hundreds of megahertz of
> spectrum, the amateur HF spectrum is quite limited. There's only enough
> room for about 450 SSB QSOs at any one time; the current arrangement leaves
> enough room for 400 SSB QSOs and about 1250 CW QSOs. During peak hours, the
> SSB allocation, as things stand now, is close to capacity. As such it makes
> a great deal of sense to encourage people to use CW on a regular basis.
> At 5 wpm, CW isn't nearly as conversational as SSB; 13 wpm represents a more
> useful level, at which CW becomes about as attractive as talking.
>

Hey, don't look now, but there is rational thought and interchange of ideas concerning no-code licensing and its happening right here in r.r.a.policy.

[Drift mode on]

One thing that rarely gets mentioned in the "Code requirement is OK for HF but useless for VHF and above" discussion is that serious weak signal work on VHF and above is often done with CW. Whether its moon bounce, OSCAR or terrestrial VHF when the copy gets tough the mode switch gets set to CW.

Not exactly an indisputable argument for a code requirement, but don't think CW doesn't get used above 50 MHz.

Bob

"Would have been a no-code tech but they made me learn it, found out the dang stuff was actually useful. I hate when that happens."

Bob Witte / HP Colo Springs / bobw@col.hp.com / KB0CY

Date: 4 Apr 93 23:25:41 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

> And Brett, before you start, I think code is a wonderful means of
> communication. I'm not trying to bash code, I just can't see any
> rationale in making it a licensing requirement over being able to
> whistle RTTY as a licensing requirement. The HF vs VHF/UHF/SHF has
> little to do with it. As has been pointed out before, the ITU makes no
> statement about how fast one must be able to communicate via code. 1
> WPM would meet the treaty requirement. And dropping the code
> requirement from the treaty is apparently already a slated topic for
> debate at the next meeting. If the ITU drops the code requirement, do
> you feel the U.S. should maintain it?

The reason the HF morse requirement should be kept as-is is that it encourages the casual, day to day use of CW, instead of or in addition to sideband. Unlike the VHF/UHF/SHF spectrum, where we possess hundreds of megahertz of spectrum, the amateur HF spectrum is quite limited. There's only enough room for about 450 SSB QSOs at any one time; the current arrangement leaves enough room for 400 SSB QSOs and about 1250 CW QSOs. During peak hours, the SSB allocation, as things stand now, is close to capacity. As such it makes a great deal of sense to encourage people to use CW on a regular basis. At 5 wpm, CW isn't nearly as conversational as SSB; 13 wpm represents a more useful level, at which CW becomes about as attractive as talking.

-Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "My boy, we are pilgrims in an unholy land."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Dr. Henry Jones Sr.

Date: Mon, 5 Apr 1993 01:23:28 GMT
From: usc!rpi!cary108.its.rpi.edu!mellob@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No Code Issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

If the ITU drops the code requirement, I would vote to keep it in the U.S.

It's pretty clear that the number of people who voluntarily use code is far less than those who involuntarily learn it to get licenses. If the code requirement is dropped, let's project where that will lead.

It is safe to say that less people will be inclined to give themselves the opportunity to realize that they might like using code.

This, and other effects of dropping the code requirement, will inevitably lead to fewer and fewer people using code on the air. (probably as they die off ;-)

I think the number of code users will become so small that more and more other hams will fight to get the "inefficient" mode off the air entirely. If I'm not stating this clearly, (which I'm probably not because I'm an engineer), just look at the controversy surrounding AM. CW will suffer the same way.

If the very few code users left would be left in peace, then dropping the code requirement wouldn't be a problem. But I know that won't happen. CW will get the heat just like AM is. By making people take code tests, they're forced to acknowledge the existence of the active CW users.

-Brett Mellor -- mellob@rpi.edu
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York

Date: Tue, 06 Apr 93 09:07:00 EDT
From: sdd.hp.com!saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!
howland.reston.ans.net!bogus.sura.net!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!emory!nanovx!
dragon!blackwlf!nj8j!ben@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: The exception proves the rule; was: Re: 2 meter phone calls?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

mcovingt@aisun3.ai.uga.edu (Michael Covington) writes:

>
> For anybody who has ever wondered precisely what was meant by the old
> saying "the exception proves the rule", here's a classic example of it:

>

Actually, the old saying uses the term 'proves' in the old sense of 'tests the validity of'. What we actually have here is the _misinterpretation_ of an old saying turning out to have some validity in and of itself :-)

Ben

```
+-----+-----+
| Ben Coleman NJ8J          | "All that is not eternal is   |
| Packet: NJ8J@W4QO.#EAL.#ATL.GA.USA.NA |      eternally irrelevant."  |
| Internet: ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us |                                |
|      or  ben@nj8j.blackwlf.mese.com |      C. S. Lewis            |
+-----+-----+
```

Date: 6 Apr 1993 19:30:32 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.bbn.com!levin@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr1.143555.22479@nrtpa038.bnr.ca>, <jfhC4tKqo.Gwo@netcom.com>,
<1993Apr5.163543.4060@nrtpa038.bnr.ca>
Subject : Re: motive ...

kme@node_17aa4.bnr.ca (Ken Michael Edwards) writes:

|In article <jfhC4tKqo.Gwo@netcom.com>, jfh@netcom.com (Jack Hamilton) writes:
||> No, it had to do with the ARRL. I thought the policy group was for amateur
||> radio policy at the federal/international level, not ARRL policy.

|I reiterate, this discussion DOES NOT BELONG HERE. You sir are discussing
|politics, not amateur radio.

No, you are wrong. And net cops are just as welcome here as they are
on the airwaves.

| I have definite political feelings, but will
|not discuss them here or on the air. It is bad form.

Except in the very next paragraph, but I guess that doesn't count.

| You
|are advocating forcing a lifestyle on those individuals.

And here you are very wrong.

Followups redirected out of here. And if you want to be a net cop,
you ought to learn how to do that.

/JBL N1MNF

Date: Mon, 05 Apr 1993 08:08:21 GMT
From: nwnexus!ole!ssc!tad@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Mar31.084349.9627@ke4zv.uucp>, <12434@news.duke.edu>,
<1993Mar31.230514.13327@ke4zv.uucp>\$
Subject : Re: 2 meter phone calls?

In article <1993Mar31.230514.13327@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:

>In article <12434@news.duke.edu> jbs@ee.egr.duke.edu (Joe B. Simpson) writes:

>>In article <1993Mar31.084349.9627@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:

>>

>>>Correct. But if the wife asks you to stop and pick up a loaf of bread,
>>>or tells you the boss just called, you've stepped over the line.

>>

>>Boss, yes; bread, no (unless the husband or the wife owns or works at the
>>bakery). How can asking someone to pick up groceries be construed as
>>conducting business?

>

>We've danced around this pole before Joe. The rules say:

>

>97.113(a) No amateur station shall transmit any communications the
>purpose of which is to facilitate the business or commercial affairs
>of *any* party. [emphasis added]

>

>It should be clear that ordering bread is no different than ordering
>pizza. It facilitates the business of the grocer. If it weren't for
>the patch, you wouldn't stop and buy the bread. Now the FCC is currently
>thinking about relaxing the no business rules, so this may soon go
>away. (And about time too.)

>

Read it again! It says that you cannot transmit communications
the PURPOSE of which is to facilitate business.

The purpose of the wife asking the husband to pick up bread is
not to facilitate the business of the grocer. The purpose is
to get the bread.

This rule was established so that the pizza place or the grocer cannot set up business communications on the ham bands.

--

Tad Cook	Phone: 206-527-4089 (home)	MCI Mail: 3288544
Seattle, WA	Packet: KT7H @ N7DUO.WA.USA.NA	3288544@mcimail.com
	Internet: tad@ssc.com	or...sumax!ole!ssc!tad

Date: Mon, 5 Apr 1993 03:10:00 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!athena!
aisun3.ai.uga.edu!mcovingt@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <0!d51vn@rpi.edu>, <1993Apr4.054915.6242@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<626@toontown.ColumbiaSC.NCR.COM>e
Subject : Re: Just waiting the OFs out

In article <626@toontown.ColumbiaSC.NCR.COM> craig@toontown.ColumbiaSC.NCR.COM
(Craig S. Williamson) writes:
>In article <1993Apr4.054915.6242@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com
(nuts2u::little) writes:
>| licensing requirements in technical and operating areas. As the new
>| blood replaces the old, the numbers will eventually be there to make
>| further licensing changes.
>| It's all a matter of time.
>|
>I hope you're right. I haven't even thought of getting a license until the
>no-code license. If I get one I probably wouldn't get a code license
>because I wouldn't use code anyway so wouldn't get proficient in code to
>progress any further. Is there a need for code anymore?

CW is now a special-purpose mode. It is very good for some things
(such as work with extremely weak signals and/or maximally simple
equipment). But it is not the essence of radio, and hasn't been since
the 1950s or earlier.

I wish that the entire history of ham radio had included more incentive
to adopt newer technologies rather than preserve old ones. In my view, one
could have made a good case for abolishing the code test as early as 1940,
for people not wanting access to the CW subbands.

Of course I am not advocating a general lowering of requirements,
merely modernizing them. I would advocate replacing the code exams

with a series of exams on digital communication.

--

```
:- Michael A. Covington      internet mcovingt@ai.uga.edu :      *****
:- Artificial Intelligence Programs    phone 706 542-0358 :      *****
:- The University of Georgia          fax 706 542-0349 :      * * *
:- Athens, Georgia 30602-7415 U.S.A.    amateur radio N4TMI :    ** *** **
```

Date: Mon, 5 Apr 1993 16:35:43 GMT

From: sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!news.uta.edu!hermes.chpc.utexas.edu!news.utdallas.edu!corpgate!brtph560!nrtpa038!node_17aa4!kme@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <jfhC4qEw5.DD4@netcom.com>, <1993Apr1.143555.22479@nrtpa038.bnr.ca>, <jfhC4tKqo.Gwo@netcom.com>t

Subject : Re: motive ...

In article <jfhC4tKqo.Gwo@netcom.com>, jfh@netcom.com (Jack Hamilton) writes:

|> kme@node_17aa4.bnr.ca (Ken Michael Edwards) wrote:

|>

|> >This whole discussion would be better served in the rec.radio.amateur.policy
|> >newsgroup (if you start pointing out where things belong). The original
posting

|> >had to do more with politcis than amateur radio, maybe you should consider

|> >alt.politics.correct ???

|>

|> No, it had to do with the ARRL. I thought the policy group was for amateur
|> radio policy at the federal/international level, not ARRL policy.

|>

|> --

|>

|> -----

|> Jack Hamilton jfh@netcom.com P. O. Box 281107 SF, CA 94128-1107

I reiterate, this discussion DOES NOT BELONG HERE. You sir are discussing politics, not amateur radio. I have definite political feelings, but will not discuss them here or on the air. It is bad form. Amateur radio is for encouraging international goodwill. This is in contradiction to the discussion of contriversal issues.

There are those who still believe a homosexual lifestyle is wrong. You are advocating forcing a lifestyle on those individuals. If you want to discuss this with me further, please post only to the radio.amateur.policy, or I will not respond.

--

=====
Ken M. Edwards, Bell Northern Research, Research Triangle Park, NC
(919) 481-8476 email: cnc23a@bnr.ca Ham: N4ZBB

All opinions are my own and do not necessarily reflect the views of
my employer or co-workers, family, friends, congress, or president.

"You'd better call my dad...My mom's pretty busy."
- Chelsea Clinton

Date: Mon, 5 Apr 1993 03:04:32 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!athena!
aisun3.ai.uga.edu!mcovingt@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <rrgd50-010493090842@222.5.80.3>,
<1993Apr1.165240.27241@hemlock.cray.com>, <1993Apr2.163126.23893@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : The exception proves the rule; was: Re: 2 meter phone calls?

For anybody who has ever wondered precisely what was meant by the old
saying "the exception proves the rule", here's a classic example of it:

In article <1993Apr2.163126.23893@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:

>
>But the FCC has specifically permitted the buying and selling of
>amateur related equipment over the air as an *exception* to their
>general rule about pecuniary interests on the air. Since they thought
>it necessary to *spell out* this exception, I think that makes clear
>their intent to *generally* prohibit such actions when applied to
>other than amateur gear.

"Exceptio probat regulam" -- Gary demonstrates the existence of a policy
by showing that an explicit exception to that policy was made.

--
:- Michael A. Covington internet mcovingt@ai.uga.edu : *****
:- Artificial Intelligence Programs phone 706 542-0358 : *****
:- The University of Georgia fax 706 542-0349 : * * *
:- Athens, Georgia 30602-7415 U.S.A. amateur radio N4TMI : ** *** **

Date: Mon, 5 Apr 1993 20:08:18 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!nshore!fmsystem!
andrews@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <0!d51vn@rpi.edu>, <1993Apr4.054915.6242@nnnnpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<626@toontown.ColumbiaSC.NCR.COM>r
Subject : Re: Just waiting the OFs out

In article <626@toontown.ColumbiaSC.NCR.COM> craig@toontown.ColumbiaSC.NCR.COM
(Craig S. Williamson) writes:
>In article <1993Apr4.054915.6242@nnnnpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com
(nuts2u::little) writes:

>|
>| Fortunately for those of us that believe the code requirements are
>| little more than antiquated hazing practices, time and soon numbers are
>| on our side. The no-code license is currently the entry license of
>| choice. I seriously doubt that all these new amateurs will turn around
>| and suggest that the no-code license be eliminated. In fact, I predict
>| they will advocate further reduction in code requirements and greater
>| licensing requirements in technical and operating areas. As the new
>| blood replaces the old, the numbers will eventually be there to make
>| further licensing changes.

>| It's all a matter of time.

>|
>I hope you're right. I haven't even thought of getting a license until the
>no-code license. If I get one I probably wouldn't get a code license
>because I wouldn't use code anyway so wouldn't get proficient in code to
>progress any further. Is there a need for code anymore?

>
>Craig
>

I am also very proud to be a "no-code". We as "no-code"rs have more
than enough band-space to play with, all the way from 6M to 10GHZ to
light and beyond. I am presently experimenting with 6M AM (real AM,
not just double-sideband with injected carrier garbage), 6M is one big
hunk of 'dead' band-space. Speaking of space, allmost all of the 'birds'
are at our disposal.

What really ticks me off is listening to a bunch of OF's, OM's, and
other comunistic Hams, talk _us_ down. Remember my friends, in 5
short years _we_ will take over_.

BTW, I'm also proud to say that I was a "CB'er" 6 years previous.

(send all flames to alt.slack)

You, sir, should realize that:

1. the two are not disjoint - the topic is the politics of amateur radio organizations.

2. an Angel of the Lord may have appointed you to regulate the terms of the discussion, but the rest of us may not recognize your authority.
3. If you make statements here, you will bloody well take responses here.

> I have definite political feelings, but will
>not discuss them here or on the air.

Your next paragraph gives the lie to this assertion.

> It is bad form. Amateur radio is
>for encouraging international goodwill. This is in contradiction to the
>discussion of contriversal issues.

However, no single group can arrogate to itself the right to forbid discussion of any issue, especially not about its own behavior, on the grounds that discussion of the topic would offend members of that group. You have not the right to unilaterally decide what is "controversial" and so "forbidden" for the whole community of amateur radio operators.

>
>There are those who still believe a homosexual lifestyle is wrong. You
>are advocating forcing a lifestyle on those individuals.

Really?!! You claim that full participation in our hobby by those of one particular sexual orientation will force those whochoose otherwise to adopt that orientation? This reeks of the claims that Gypsies steal little children and Force you, or anyone, to adopt some "lifestyle"? Of course not. Insist on common politeness and acceptance of _all_ our fellow hams on the air andin our national and international organizations. Of course. Good grief man, this isn't the dark ages! I hope. 8-)

> If you want to
>discuss this with me further, please post only to the radio.amateur.policy,
>or I will not respond.

Interesting that you insist on a right to unilaterally set the terms of discussion and to exclude others from the forum. What was the name of that Angel, anyway?

If, of course, you choose to withdraw because you find the people here uncongenial you mightrecall that was the genesis of this discussion:

The

fact that Gay hams are made to feel so uncomfortable that they finally seek more congenial company - and the difficulty they have had in availing themselves of national circulation Ham magazines in arranging that.

73

--

Ed Schaefer K9JMA

Date: Mon, 5 Apr 1993 14:52:13 GMT
From: usc!wupost!emory!athena!aisun3.ai.uga.edu!mcovingt@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <fritza.733424191@well.sf.ca.us>,
<sumner.733692738@milo.math.scarolina.edu>, <11857@prijat.cs.uofs.edu>
Subject : History of the issue; was: Re: 2 meter phone calls?

One thing worth remembering is the history of FCC policy on this issue.

For a long time, there was no actual rule against business communications via ham radio; it was just taken for granted that hams wouldn't do any substantial amount of it.

Then the rule was introduced, but with a fairly loose interpretation of what constitutes a business communication. Then -- over the past few years -- the FCC has issued a number of statements tightening it. Most recently, they were concerned about boaters using amateur radio to arrange all their supply purchases, when they should have been using marine radio.

The FCC's _intent_ was never to overly restrict our hobby or personal activities; rather, they were going after what they perceived to be specific abuses that most hams are probably unaware of.

--

:- Michael A. Covington internet mcovingt@ai.uga.edu : *****
:- Artificial Intelligence Programs phone 706 542-0358 : *****
:- The University of Georgia fax 706 542-0349 : * * *
:- Athens, Georgia 30602-7415 U.S.A. amateur radio N4TMI : ** *** **

Date: Tue, 06 Apr 1993 15:38:32 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!csn!yuma!galen@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr4.054915.6242@nnnnpd2.cxo.dec.com>,

<626@toontown.ColumbiaSC.NCR.COM>, <C5119v.5rv@fmsystem.ncoast.org>
Subject : Re: Just waiting the OFs out

In article <C5119v.5rv@fmsystem.ncoast.org> andrews@fmsystem.ncoast.org (Andrew Sargent N80FS) writes:

>I am also very proud to be a "no-code". We as "no-code"rs have more
>than enough band-space to play with, all the way from 6M to 10GHZ to
>light and beyond. I am presently experimenting with 6M AM (real AM,
>not just double-sideband with injected carrier garbage), 6M is one big
>hunk of 'dead' band-space. Speaking of space, almost all of the 'birds'
>are at our disposal.
>
>What really ticks me off is listening to a bunch of OF's, OM's, and
>other comunistic Hams, talk _us_ down. Remember my friends, in 5
>short years _we_ will take over_.

Not unless _WE_ join ARRL, become officers in clubs, get on FCC advisory
comittees, and generally run the OF's out of the radio politics.

Talk is cheap, actions speak louder than words.

Get involved.

I'm an advanced, working on 20wpm for the X, and I will probably
never use code after the test. I agree that it's an antiquated
hazing practice with no connection to reality.
You can argue that CW is more efficient, but since there is a human
factor involved, there is a lot of room for error. If you want to
make the efficiency argument, computers will make CW more obsolete
than it already is.

Galen Watts, KF0YJ, President, Colo St Univ Amateur Radio Club.
"I've invented the zero!"
"What?"
"Nothing, nothing."

Date: 5 Apr 1993 17:26:19 +0300
From: mcsun!news.funet.fi!butler.cc.tut.fi!lehtori.cc.tut.fi!not-for-
mail@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <0!d51vn@rpi.edu>, <1993Apr4.054915.6242@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<626@toontown.ColumbiaSC.NCR.COM>f
Subject : Re: Just waiting the OFs out

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>
> Fortunately for those of us that believe the code requirements are
> little more than antiquated hazing practices, time and soon numbers are
> on our side. The no-code license is currently the entry license of
> choice. I seriously doubt that all these new amateurs will turn around
> and suggest that the no-code license be eliminated. In fact, I predict
> they will advocate further reduction in code requirements and greater
> licensing requirements in technical and operating areas. As the new
> blood replaces the old, the numbers will eventually be there to make
> further licensing changes.
>
> It's all a matter of time.

While waiting, there is a big risk that this hobby (at least the HF part of it) becomes a harmless spare-time activity for senior citizens (no pun intended). It is much harder to justify our frequency allocations, when the service aspects of this hobby are no longer valid. We must constantly prove to the community that we do a service to it. And I don't mean just emergency communications or similar events but rather the self-training side of the hobby (science, technology, foreign languages, etc) specially for young kids.

> And dropping the code
> requirement from the treaty is apparently already a slated topic for
> debate at the next meeting. If the ITU drops the code requirement, do
> you feel the U.S. should maintain it?

ITU is an international organisation and it does only what its member states wants it to do. I don't see why national PTTs in industrialized countries any longer should want to enforce world-wide code requirements at their own initiative. It is more or less a matter between the national radio amateur societies and the national PTTs.

As far as I understand, the ITU code requirement can only be dropped in a HF-WARC conference. A proposal should be submitted to the next HF-WARC to change the wording from something like "CW is required below 30 MHz" to something like "Each national PTT can demand proficiency in CW below 30 MHz". Countries that still wants to maintain the code requirement could vote for this proposal. Then each country (or its national PTT or national radio amateur society) could maintain the code requirement or drop it at any convinient time.

If the wording is not changed in the next HF-WARC meeting,

the next time this wording can be changed in a subsequent
HF-WARC after that a decade or more. This delay might be
the end of most progressive radio amateur activity in
HF-bands.

Paul OH3LWR

Mail: Hameenpuisto 42 A 26 Phone : +358-31-133 657
 SF-33200 TAMPERE Telex : 58-100 1825 (ATTN: Keinanen Paul)
 FINLAND Internet: Paul.Keinanen@Telebox.tele.fi
X.400 : G=Paul S=Keinanen O=Elisa-Tampere A=ELISA C=FI

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #86
